

BASIL MARCEAUX, SR., )  
 )  
v. ) Case No. 1:13-cv-364-HSM-SKL  
 )  
CITY OF CLEVELAND, TENNESSEE )  
d/b/a Basil Marceaux, *et al.* )

The standard required by § 1915(e)(2) to properly state a claim for which relief can be granted is the same standard required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). *Brand v. Motley*, 526 F.3d 921, 924 (6th Cir. 2008); *accord Thomas v. Eby*, 481 F.3d 434, 437 (6th Cir. 2007). In determining whether a party has set forth a claim in his complaint for which relief can be granted, all well-pleaded factual allegations contained in the complaint must be accepted as true. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam); *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). “Specific facts are not necessary; the statement need only ‘give the defendant fair notice of what the claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.’” *Erickson*, 551 U.S. at 93, (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 569-70.) Further, a *pro se* pleading must be liberally

construed and “held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” *Erickson*, 551 U.S. at 94 (citing *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)).

Mr. Marceaux’s complaint is frivolous and nonsensical. Mr. Marceaux regularly burdens this Court with virtually incomprehensible and frivolous filings. *See, e.g., Marceaux v. U.S. Marine Corps, d/b/a Basil Marceaux, et al.*, Case No. 1:12-cv-399, (Dec. 3, 2012); *Marceaux v. Red Bank et al.*, Case No. 4:10-cv-75, (Dec. 22, 2011). Accordingly, it is **RECOMMENDED**<sup>1</sup> that Mr. Marceaux’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* be **DENIED** and this action be **DISMISSED** in its entirety.

s/ Susan K. Lee

SUSAN K. LEE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Any objections to this Report and Recommendation must be served and filed within fourteen (14) days after service of a copy of this recommended disposition on the objecting party. Such objections must conform to the requirements of Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Failure to file objections within the time specified waives the right to appeal the District Court’s order. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 88 L.Ed.2d 435, 106 S. Ct. 466 (1985). The district court need not provide *de novo* review where objections to this report and recommendation are frivolous, conclusive or general. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986). Only specific objections are reserved for appellate review. *Smith v. Detroit Federation of Teachers*, 829 F.2d 1370 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987).